

E 458

.4

.W18

Copy 2



Class E458

14
Book VI 8

copy 2

LETTER OF HON. R. J. WALKER, 498
247
IN FAVOR OF THE
RE-ELECTION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

LONDON, SEPT. 30, 1864.

THE succession of days and years and centuries is noted in calendars; but it is great events, constituting historical epochs, that mark the progress and destiny of our race. Decisive battles, vast reforms, civil or religious, great scientific discoveries or mechanical inventions, dynastic changes, political revolutions, the union or dismemberment of states, the birth or death of republics, the rise or fall of empires—these are the deep notches in the groove of time, the mighty landmarks in the pathway of humanity. It is the fate of the American Union, involving the liberty of our country and mankind, that is to be decided in our approaching Presidential election. How paltry are all party questions in the presence of an issue so transcendent as this! How dare we mingle old party names or conflicts with such a question, when the life of the Union is trembling in the balance! The maintenance of the Union is the one majestic question, and the *Union party*, in name, and in fact, is the only one that should exist, until this great issue is decided. Then, when the Union is rescued from present and future peril,

we may exhume the past, use old party names, or discuss old party issues, but until then to unfold a party banner, and revive old party prejudices, is treason to our country and mankind. It is not Democrats alone, or Republicans alone, as separate parties marshalled against each other, that can save the Union. During this struggle for the Union, we do not hear of Democratic or Republican admirals or generals, divisions or regiments; no, we have only one great Union army, discarding all party names or symbols, and fighting only for and under the banner of the Union. It is then a grave objection to the Chicago McClellan Convention, that, in such a crisis as this, it summoned only a *Democratic* Convention, and appealed only to the *Democratic* party to save the Government. As well might we summon only a Democratic army to fight the battles of our country, as conduct such an election as this under any old party name and banner. Thousands of Republicans as well as Democrats, together, under the banner of the Union, fight now the battles of their country. Thousands of Republican as well as Demo-

F-4
W18
Copy 2

cratic soldiers sleep in their bloody shrouds, or lie wounded on beds of agony; but who dare ask to what party they belonged? It was an unholy ambition, stimulated by party leaders, a thirst for office and emoluments, that rallied under an old party name at Chicago, when the whole people should have been summoned to the rescue.

And who met in council at Chicago? Was it the friends of the Union? No, it was Democrats, as they called themselves, whether unionists or disunionists. Avowed disunionists constituted a large and influential portion of the Convention (profaning the name of Democrats) that met together at Chicago. Who were Vallandigham and Harris and Long and many other of their compeers, who not only met together at Chicago, but some of whom were received with shouts of applause, and resolutions moved by some of them unanimously adopted. It was a meeting of loyal men and disloyal peace and war men, unionists and disunionists. Every disunionist is a traitor. He is for the overthrow of the Republic, upon the demand of rebels in arms against the Government. Every peace man now on the Chicago McClellan platform is a disunionist and a traitor, because he knows, in his inmost soul, that no peace can be obtained but upon the ultimatum of Jefferson Davis, now officially proclaimed by him through the secretary of state to foreign Governments, namely, the severance of the Union, and the establishment throughout the South of a separate slave-holding empire. Most of these peace men openly avow their disunion doctrines, while others attempt to conceal their treason, under the transparent mask of an "armistice," a "cessation of hostilities," and an *ultimate* "convention of the States," ignominiously declaring, at the same time, by their platform resolutions at Chicago, that to suppress the rebellion by war *has proved a failure*. What truly loyal man, by voting for their candidates, will indorse at the polls such a

platform as this? It is a surrender of our country's honor—it is a capitulation, upon the demand of Southern traitors, whose hands are dripping with the warm life blood of our sons and brothers, and who now boldly and defiantly *pledge themselves* to foreign Governments, as they always had declared to us, that they will have no peace unless based upon disunion. Did a Democratic Convention ever before receive avowed Disunionists and traitors among its number? Did it ever before trail in the dust the glorious flag of our country? Did it ever agree before, that our flag should be torn down from half the States and territory of the Union, and replaced by a foreign standard, having upon it but one emblazonry—the divinity and perpetuity of Slavery? And shall we treat with the Confederate authorities on this basis? No; while we will gladly treat with States and people *desiring to return to the Union*, with Jefferson Davis and his Cabinet brandishing over our heads the two-edged sword of Slavery and disunion, we will, in the emphatic words of General Jackson, "*negotiate only from the mouths of our cannon.*"

General Jackson was, in truth, the father and founder of the Democratic party. Prior to his first nomination in 1823, in the election of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, the parties were known as Federal and Republican. In the fall of 1823, I united with a few friends in calling, at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, the first *Democratic* meeting, by which General Jackson was nominated as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency of the United States. I offered the resolutions in his favor adopted by that meeting, calling the Democratic State Convention of Pennsylvania which confirmed that nomination in March, 1824. I attended that Convention, as a delegate from Pittsburg, and wrote the address of the Convention to the Democracy of the State and of the Union on that momentous occasion. I supported General Jackson for the Presidency in 1823 (my first

vote), 1824, 1828, and 1832, and uniformly adhered to the Democratic party until after the rebellion of 1861.

During the great nullification and secession question of South Carolina, on the first Monday of January, 1833, at Natchez, Mississippi, I made the opening speech, then published, against nullification and secession, in favor of "war," if necessary to maintain the Union—in favor of "*coercion*," to put down rebellion in any State. The Legislature of Mississippi indorsed that speech, and passed resolutions declaring nullification and *secession* to be *treason*, and, upon THAT ISSUE, I was elected by the Legislature to the Senate of the United States. If Mississippi, under the influence of Jefferson Davis, and other traitor leaders, has since that period abandoned those principles, she cannot expect me to follow her, and thereby surrender opinions which I have uniformly maintained and advocated throughout my life, but more especially from 1833 until the present period. Mississippi (whose prosperity I would restore by bringing her back to the Union) indorsed those opinions when she elected me to the Senate of the United States over an avowed and distinguished secessionist (George Poinexter), after a contest of unexampled violence, personal and political, extending from January, 1833, to January, 1836.

It was on that occasion that General Jackson wrote his celebrated letter in favor of my election and sustaining my political course. It was after the adoption of the secession ordinance by Carolina, that General Jackson sent our war vessels to Charleston to hold and blockade the harbor, and our troops, under the illustrious Scott, to maintain, by force, if necessary, the authority of the Federal Government over the forts commanding the city of Charleston. Let us suppose that the rebels had then shot down our flag, captured our forts, made war upon the Union, and proceeded to dissolve it by force—let us sup-

pose that a committee from any convention had then dared to nominate him for the Presidency upon such a platform as that adopted at Chicago, proposing an armistice and cessation of hostilities until a National Convention could be assembled, accompanied by the declaration that the rebellion could not be crushed by war, who doubts what would have been the course of that devoted patriot? He would have stamped the disgraceful and treasonable resolutions under his feet, and indignantly scouted the traitors who offered them. And now this McClellan Convention at Chicago professes to represent the Democratic party. As Jefferson was the founder of the *Republican* party, Jackson was the father of the *Democratic* party. Now, with perhaps one exception, is there a *single member* of that Convention (assuming the name of 'Democratic') that (like myself) supported General Jackson in 1823, 1824, 1828, and 1832, and uniformly adhered to the Democratic party until after the rebellion of 1861?

What right had that Convention to assume the name of Democracy, while trampling upon the advice of the founder of the party, and all its great and vital principles? How dare they offer an 'armistice' and 'the cessation of hostilities' to rebels in arms against their country, especially when the so-called rebel government had again and again declared that they would negotiate upon no terms, except the acknowledgment of their independence, and the definitive dissolution of the Union? But, above all, how dare they record the disgraceful and treasonable falsehood, that the war to suppress the rebellion had failed, and ask the free-men of America to indorse at the polls such a declaration?

And has, indeed, all the blood of patriots shed in defence of the Union in this war, been poured out in vain? Ye patriot soldiers! now in the field, say, are you unable or unwilling to suppress the rebellion? Say it not only in words,

but answer the foul accusation by your votes in the approaching Presidential election.

The Chicago McClellan Convention says that the war is a failure, and that therefore there must be an armistice and a cessation of hostilities. Will not your answer at the polls be this: 'It is a foul and treasonable falsehood?'

And is this war for the Union indeed a failure? Let our many and well-fought battles upon the ocean and the land answer the question. Let a country nearly as large as half of Europe, taken from the rebels since the war commenced, respond. Let Shiloh, and Donaldson, and Gettysburg and Vicksburg, and Port Hudson, and New Orleans, and the Mississippi from its source to its mouth, answer. Why, this wretched calumny had scarcely been uttered by the McClellan Convention, when Sherman, the great commander, and his army had washed out the accusation in the blood of the vanquished, and unfolded our banner at Atlanta, the grand military strategic centre of Georgia, never to be recalled. And while the shouts of the great victory in Georgia were still sounding in our ears, Oppequan responded to the thunders of Atlanta, and the heroic Sheridan, after a decided victory, was driving the rebel army from the valley of Virginia. Was Sherman's campaign from Memphis and Nashville to Chattanooga, and from Chattanooga to Atlanta, a failure? Why, that campaign is unsurpassed in history. Was Grant's Potomac advance a failure? What, the hero of the great campaign of the West, terminating with the capture of Vicksburg and its garrison, not know, or do his duty! Was the victory of the Wilderness a failure, or the destruction in successive battles of one third of Lee's army, together with the seizure of the great Weldon Railroad, or the repulse there of the Confederate attack—were these failures? Recollect, Grant was Lieutenant-General, subordinate only to the President and Secretary of War, in planning the whole

campaign, and, while too much credit cannot be given to the heroic Sherman and noble Sheridan, and their gallant armies, yet, it must be remembered, that their great victories and strategic military movements are but a part of Grant's plan—*concentrating* the three armies of the Potomac, the Shenandoah, and the West, so as to seize and hold all the roads connecting with Richmond, and capture the Confederate army and government.

And now as to our navy. Were the gallant deeds of Admiral Porter at Vicksburg, on the Mississippi River, the Arkansas, and the Red River, failures? Were the destruction of the forts protecting New Orleans and the capture of that city by the illustrious Farragut failures? Were the capture or destruction by that gallant man, aided by General Granger, of the forts commanding the Bay of Mobile, together with the occupation of its harbor by our fleet—and the destruction there of the Confederate navy—were these failures? Were the capture of the forts and city of Pensacola, of all the Florida forts, and the fortifications commanding Savannah—the defeat of the Merrimac and Tennessee—the destruction of the Alabama—the capture of Port Royal, and of the forts which commanded it—were these failures? No; the war is not a failure. It is a glorious and transcendent success. Already the whole Southern and South-western coast is ours. The whole of the Mississippi is ours, with far more than a thousand miles of its course from Columbus to its mouth, and even to a considerable extent up the Mississippi and Missouri, which had been once in the hands of the enemy. Chesapeake Bay is ours, and all its tributaries, from the Potomac to the James River. The whole coast of North and South Carolina, of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, with vast portions of the interior, including many impregnable positions, is ours. Tennessee, one of the seceded States, is now wholly ours. Kentucky is loyal. Mis-

souri is ours, and has abolished Slavery. Maryland is ours, and has, I believe, uprooted Slavery also. Our whole *Territorial* domain, greater in extent than one half of Europe (and about Slavery in which this contest began), is now wholly ours. Not a rebel flag floats within its limits. When before were such mighty conquests achieved within so short a period? Why, the conquests of Alexander, of Cæsar and Napoleon covered no such extent of territory. And, 'we take no steps backward.' Where our flag now is once unfolded in any part of rebel-dom, there it continues to float, and will float forever. What are we to negotiate about? Is it as to giving up the Mississippi and its tributaries, together with New Orleans, Vicksburg, and Tennessee? Is West Virginia, which has been admitted as a new Free State, to be surrendered? Are Fortress Monroe and the Chesapeake to be abandoned? Is the rebel flag to float at Alexandria, and on the heights of Arlington; and are rebel cannon to be planted there, in sight of and to command the *very capital of the Union?* Are we to insult loyal Kentucky, Missouri, Maryland, and Delaware, by negotiating about them? Are we to give back Western to Eastern Virginia? Where is the line of division to be run, and what armies would be strong enough to maintain peace upon the border? What portion of the mighty Territories uniting us with the Pacific are to be surrendered? Are we to turn over to the cruel despotism of their bloody and relentless masters, the millions of loyal people of the South, to whom we have given the most sacred pledge of the protection of the Union? And, last of all, are the two millions of slaves, as Jefferson Davis complains, who have been emancipated by the constitutional war proclamation of President Lincoln, are they to be remanded to Slavery, including the thousands who have so gallantly fought in our defence? And as to Slavery, or what, if any, may be

left of it, when the war is over, are we to abandon the unquestionable right to abolish it, as Mr. Lincoln and his friends propose, by a constitutional amendment? Is Jefferson Davis to come back again as Senator from Mississippi? Are the traitors Cobb and Thompson to take their places in the McClellan Cabinet? Is Toombs, of Georgia, (as he boasted) to call the roll of his slaves on the Boston Common? Slavery, we know, was the sole cause of the war. It was Slavery that fired the first gun at Sumter, and demanded to rule or ruin the country. It was in the name of Slavery that the South seceded; and it was to extend and perpetuate Slavery, as a blessed and divine institution, that they avowedly framed the Confederate constitution. In the debates of Congress of 1860-'61, in the proceedings of the Committee of 1833, in the acts of the Peace Congress, in the various secession ordinances, by the very terms of the Confederate constitution, Slavery was the sole cause of this war upon the Government. Slavery was and is our great enemy, and shall we not destroy it? Slavery was the sole cause of the war, and shall it not be eradicated? When the patient calls for a physician, he seeks for the source of the disease, so as not merely to alleviate present pain, but to remove the cause, and prevent relapses or successive attacks. If he deals only with palliatives, to assuage for a brief period the present suffering, when he can remove the cause, and restore the patient to permanent and perfect health, he is but a quack and an impostor.

The party supporting Mr. Lincoln is composed of men of all the old parties. Its candidate for the Presidency is from the North, and belonged to the late Republican party. Its candidate for the Vice Presidency, a brave, loyal, Union-loving man, is from the South, and belonged (like myself) to the old Democratic party. But the Baltimore Convention, in the spirit of true nationality and patriotism, discarded all old party

names or issues. It acted only in the name of the Union, and as one great Union party, and asked all patriots, dismissing for the present all old party names or issues, to unite with it for the salvation of the Union.

My first objection, then, to the organization against Mr. Lincoln is, that it is a mere party organization, arrayed under an old party name, and marching under an old party banner. In the midst of a great contest like this, when all old party names and prejudices should be forgotten, and when Democrats and Republicans should be united as brethren in the one grand effort to suppress the rebellion, the Chicago McClellan Convention reopens old party strifes, renews old party issues, and, denouncing Republicans, assumes the name and professes to represent the Democratic party. It was the banner of the Union that was raised by the Convention at Baltimore, and the salvation of the Union, with its rescue from present and future perils, the suppression of the rebellion, with the removal of the cause, constituted the only issues presented by that Convention to the whole of the loyal States of all parties.

It was far otherwise at Chicago. It was a mere assemblage of partisans, some for, and some against the Union, in the search of power and emoluments. It was the flag of the Union that was given to the breeze at Baltimore. It was the flag of a party that was unfolded at Chicago. '*For the Union*' was written on the flag of the one—'*For the Democratic party*' was inscribed on the standard of the other. It was said that the Baltimore Convention has made the abolition of Slavery one of its issues; but, as well might it be objected that it had made the prosecution of the war, or the maintenance of the army or navy, part of its creed. The Emancipation Proclamation of the President had its whole constitutional force as a *war measure* TO SAVE THE UNION, and, as such, it was adopted by Mr. Lin-

coln as ex-officio commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States.' That it was, as a war measure, perfectly constitutional, I have never doubted, and so declared in an article published at the time in THE CONTINENTAL MAGAZINE. It is the duty of all *persons*, not aliens, to unite with the President in suppressing a rebellion. Slaves, in the relation which they occupy to the National Government under the Federal Constitution, are '*persons*.' As *persons*, they are thrice named in the Constitution, and by no other name whatever. Especially, under the clause providing for direct taxation, they are *enumerated as persons*, not *valued as property*. The term '*person*' is used more frequently in the Constitution than any other, and it is applied expressly to slaves, and to the whole people of the United States, including the President and Vice President, who are designated therein as persons. This very question, whether slaves are persons or property under the Constitution, arose in the great case of *Groves vs. Slaughter*, when, in 1841 (with a single dissenting opinion, that of Judge Baldwin), after the fullest argument on both sides, it was unanimously decided by the Supreme Court of the United States that slaves, in the relation which they hold to the National Government under the Federal Constitution, are *persons only*, and *not property*. Were it otherwise, Massachusetts could not forbid the introduction of slaves from the South for sale there as merchandise; for Massachusetts could not prohibit the introduction of the cotton or any property of the South for sale as merchandis within her limits, for that would have been a prohibition of the *exports from State to State*, which is forbidden by the Federal Constitution. My own elaborate argument before the Court, as one of the counsel in that case, will be found in the appendix to the first edition of the 15th volume of Peters's Reports. As *persons*, the President has a right to call for the aid of all residing

in the United States, except aliens, to suppress the rebellion. He has a right to call for the services of the loyal or rebel masters for such a purpose, as well as for the service of their slaves.

It cannot be denied, that the masters, whether rebel or loyal, may be called and even forced by conscription into the army to suppress the rebellion. Would it not then be strange if the master could exempt his slaves from similar services? The only right of the master recognized by the Constitution, is to the 'service or labor' of his slaves. But he has a right equally strong to his own service or labor; yet both must yield to the paramount right of the Government to the services of both or either to suppress the rebellion. There is not a single word in the Federal Constitution which, either by inference or express declaration, exempts slaves, more than any other persons, from the call of the Federal Government to aid in suppressing a rebellion. Such is the construction given by the South to the so-called Confederate constitution, which is much more stringent than ours in that respect, for it recognizes slaves as property; yet, the rebel authorities, the rebel congress and government, force slaves, even by conscription, to perform military duty—to dig the trenches—to make the earthworks—to erect the barracks and arsenals—to help to make the cannon, small arms, and powder, and vessels of war—to construct the fortifications—to transport the provisions, munitions, and cannon for their armies, together with the tents and military equipage—to raise the food indispensable for the support of their military forces—and, of course, they would, *if they dare*, put arms in their hands to meet us on the battle field. It is clear, then, not as a confiscation of property (which is also constitutional under certain circumstances), but as *persons*, that we have a right to the service of the slaves as well as of their masters to suppress the rebellion. But it is only by emancipation (with com-

pensation for loss of their services by loyal men) that the slaves can be called into our army, and used to suppress the rebellion. A call by the President for the slaves to serve in our armies, to risk their lives and shed their blood for the Union, accompanied by the declaration that they were still slaves, and, upon the termination of the war, such as survived would be restored to their masters, with whom their wives and children must still remain in bondage, would be an atrocious crime, as well as the climax of all absurdities. No; it is only by emancipation that the services of the slaves can or ought to be obtained for the suppression of the rebellion. The Emancipation Proclamation then of the President, with compensation to loyal masters, is most clearly constitutional during the continuance of the war, and as a war measure to suppress the rebellion and save the Union, and such must be the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, to which tribunal the President has properly submitted the final arbitrament of the constitutional question. It is true, when the rebellion is crushed, the President can issue no new emancipation proclamation. But neither can he then recall or modify the one already issued; and if he had the power to recall the proclamation, it would be an act of perfidy unparalleled in the history of the world. The nation would be so utterly disgraced by such bad faith as would be involved in the revocation of the Emancipation Proclamation, as to earn the contempt of all honest and honorable men, and the loss of sympathy of the industrial classes and working men of Europe, whose rulers would then no longer fear to recognize or aid the South. It was the magnificent uprising of the working classes of England in favor of the Union, that alone saved both countries from a bloody and disastrous war.

The Emancipation Proclamation being, as we have seen, clearly constitutional, as a war measure, with a view

to save the Union, was it, as such, wise and expedient? We have seen that the rebel South, even by conscription, when necessary, used slaves for military purposes, and those not used directly in that way are required to raise breadstuffs and provisions (instead of cotton), to supply the Confederate army. Indeed the debates of Congress for many years past, will show that the South boasted, not vainly, of their great military strength, because they declared that, while the slaves would be used in raising provisions to supply their forces, the whole white population capable of bearing arms could then be called into the field. This constituted, as they declared, their *great military strength*. And is it not then a most important war measure, to deprive them of that all-powerful and efficient weapon: which, we have seen, can only be done by emancipation? Now, let us suppose that while we refuse the use of the colored race, whether bond or free, in aid of the war, they are used for that purpose by the South, what would be the result? By the census of 1860, the whole population of the United States was 31,445,080, of which there were white, 26,975,575; free colored, 487,996; slaves, 3,953,760; total, of colored, 4,441,756, of which there were in the seceded States 3,653,110, and in the loyal States, 788,446. Add the whites in the seceded States, 5,449,463, which thus make the whole population of those States, by the census of 1860, 9,102,573. In the loyal States, the whole population was 22,342,507; of which 21,553,861 were white, and 788,646 colored. Now then, if the colored race, as we have seen, in the seceding States, are used for war purposes by them and not by us, the relative number of opposing forces would be as follows: Loyal States, 21,553,861; seceded States, 9,102,573; difference in favor of the Loyal States, 12,451,288. Now, to begin the process, add to the whites in the Loyal States the free colored, and the total number is 22,342,507;

seceded States, 9,102,573; difference in favor of the Loyal States, 13,239,934. Continuing the process, if we deduct by the emancipation policy the whole colored population of the seceded States, the result would be, Loyal States, 22,342,507; seceded States, 5,449,463. But if, concluding the process, by the emancipation policy we not only deduct the colored race from the aid of the South, but add it in aid of the Loyal States, the result would be, Loyal States, 25,995,617; seceded States, 5,449,463; difference in favor of Loyal States, 20,456,154. Thus the policy opposed to emancipation and to the use of the colored race by us in the war, makes the difference in our favor as against the South only 12,451,288, whereas the difference in our favor by the emancipation policy of the President is 20,456,154. Deduct from this the above 12,451,288; final difference, 8,094,866. Thus we see that, by the President's policy, there is, in effect, a gain to the Loyal States equivalent to more than eight millions of people, more than 200,000 of whom are already soldiers in the Union army, all of whom must be disbanded if Mr. Lincoln's policy was erroneous. Will any say that a policy which makes a difference in the relative forces of the two contending parties of more than eight millions of people in favor of the North, and which has already increased our army 200,000, is not a most important war measure, aiding us to suppress the rebellion and save the Government? and, therefore, it is a policy eminently calculated to preserve and perpetuate the Union. Indeed, it is this measure which renders the maintenance of the Union certain, and, without it, the Union is subjected to great peril.

As, then, the emancipation policy of the President is not only wise, beneficent, and constitutional, but renders certain the preservation of the Union, while that of his opponents subjects it to imminent peril, I go for the reelection of Mr. Lincoln. I go for him as a

Union man, and because his emancipation policy will certainly save the Union; and I go against his opponent, because, however loyal he may be, and however sincere his desire to save the Union, practically he is a disunionist, because, independent of the Chicago McClellan platform, his anti-emancipation and anti-negro policy subjects the Union to imminent peril. Now, with me, in this, as in all preceding elections, the preservation and perpetuation of the Union constituted the great transcendent question, involving the liberty of our country and mankind, and I can give no vote which subjects it to the slightest peril. Save the Union, and all else will be added in time (including the *ultimate* downfall of Slavery, which I predicted and advocated in January, 1844), has been the doctrine of my life. To that doctrine I still adhere, but support the President's emancipation policy *now*, because it is the most efficient, if not the only means of saving and perpetuating the Union. I opposed emancipation when it was unconstitutional as a *peace measure*, and because I knew it would cause civil war, invite foreign intervention, and endanger the Union. I support emancipation now, because it is constitutional, greatly diminishes the danger of foreign intervention, and insures the maintenance and perpetuity of the Union. I supported Judge Douglas and opposed the election of Mr. Lincoln in 1860, because I believed it would imperil the Union. While always denying that his election would justify disunion, I feared that the rebellion would be the result. In voting against Mr. Lincoln in 1860, I did so to save the Union from peril. In voting for him now, it is to suppress the rebellion and maintain the Union. It is not for Mr. Lincoln as a man (however worthy he may be), that I now vote—I vote for principles—I vote for the Union—and in supporting him, I vote for the best, if not the only means to maintain and perpetuate the Union.

But there is another principle of vital

importance involved in this election. The South, under the banner of Slavery, proceeded to secede from the Union, immediately after the result of the Presidential election of 1860 was made known. South Carolina seceded in December, 1860. Mississippi followed early in January, 1861, and the Cotton States all followed during that and the succeeding month of February. Now, Mr. Lincoln was not and could not be inaugurated as President until March, 1861. The South did not and would not wait for his inaugural address of that date to know, under the new condition of affairs, what would be the policy of his Administration. They did not and would not wait for any measures of his Administration, much less any act of the Government or of Congress, but proceeded to secede merely because Mr. Lincoln had been constitutionally elected to the Presidency by the people of the United States. Such an act was an overthrow of the great fundamental principle of all free government, namely, that the majority shall govern under the forms of the Constitution. It was an attack upon the right of suffrage, an assault upon the ballot box and the great principle of an elective President, as provided in our Constitution, and which lies at the very basis of free institutions. That principle is the vital element of our existence. It is 'the casing air' of liberty. Take it away, and freedom instantly expires. The right of suffrage is the great American right of every citizen, rich or poor, humble or exalted. It is the great palladium of our liberty. It is a Government, like a mighty pyramid, reposing on its broad and immovable base, the will and affections of the people. It is the people's Government, and therefore the people maintain it, and with us two millions of volunteers have rushed to its support. Therefore, while it is the best Government in peace, it is the strongest in war. But secession because of the election of a President, is not only war upon the

Union, but war upon the elective franchise, the great fundamental principle of free government, and without which it is but a fleeting shadow. Democrats—people of all parties—my countrymen, while you are asked now by the Chicago Convention to vote against Mr. Lincoln, you would nullify by that very vote the right of suffrage, because, what is that suffrage worth, what is your vote but an empty form, if it may not elect your President? But if, because the minority who have voted against you, dissatisfied with your choice, can rebel, make war upon you, because you thus voted, and set up another President for that minority by force of arms, what is that but to say that the majority shall not rule; that the right of suffrage shall be nullified; that the Constitution, under which that vote was given, shall be overthrown? This is what the rebellion has done in attempting to destroy the Republic, merely because of the election of Mr. Lincoln. This arrogant and insolent slave-holding oligarchy would not even wait to hear what the President of your choice would say. They treated the President of your choice, and therefore they treated you and the Constitution under which you acted, with scorn and defiance. So long as you would act with them, so long as the Northern parasites would adhere to the Southern upas tree of Slavery, so long as the ‘nudsills’ of the North, as they arrogantly called you, would obey the orders of their Southern masters, so long as you would be their slaves, they would permit the President to be inaugurated. But so soon as you elected a President against their dictation, then your suffrages should be nullified by the rebellion of a minority against the majority. What is this but to say, that the majority shall not elect a President, and thus render the right of suffrage an empty form, striking at the fundamental principle of free government, and substituting the *bayonets* of the minority for the *ballots* of the majority of the people?

Freemen of America, is it possible that by voting against Mr. Lincoln now because of the Southern rebellion, you will thus declare that the election of a President by the people is not to be maintained, but that his reelection is to be defeated, and that his authority, as your President and as your representative, is therefore never to extend over the *whole United States*, because a rebellious minority oppose it by force of arms? This is one of the transcendent issues involved in this contest. It is in fact the great question whether the majority shall rule or the minority—whether self-government is an unreal mockery, or whether it is indeed a God-given right of *man*, born in the image of his Maker. You voted that Mr. Lincoln should be President of the *whole United States*. That was your decision at the ballot box. Has it been obeyed? No: an arrogant slave-holding minority has rebelled against it, and, within the boundaries of the area occupied by that minority, has suppressed your election by the bayonet, and substituted Jefferson Davis, one of the rebel leaders, in place of Abraham Lincoln. Within the limits of that rebellion, the power, under the Constitution, which you devolved upon Abraham Lincoln, has been nullified by force of arms, and now, if you abandon the war, or defeat his reelection, your choice will have been nullified, and he never will have exercised throughout the United States the power given to him by your suffrages under the Constitution. Now the party in the North thus acquiescing in this destruction of the right of suffrage, dares to assume the sacred name of Democracy, which you know is but Anglicized Greek, meaning the *power of the people*. Shade of the immortal Jackson! the father and founder of the Democratic party, burst the ceremonies of the Hermitage, and blast with the thunders of New Orleans the wretched traitors who thus dare to profane the sacred name under which you were chosen President of the United States.

But there is another grave objection to the McClellan platform adopted at Chicago. It is its *intentional ambiguity*. The Convention was composed of unionists and disunionists, of peace and war Democrats, as they style themselves, and the platform was adapted to suit the views of both these parties in and out of the Convention. It was a platform upon which the temple of Janus was to be closed, but with side doors at either extremity, into one of which the peace men with their olive branches should enter, and the war men in full military array in the other, and the lion and the lamb meet together in the centre in cordial agreement. But, it appears that the war men in this case were only asses in lions' skins, for in the compromise between antagonistic principles and candidates, the peace men got far the better of the bargain. While there were some vague and glittering generalities in favor of the Union, they were connected with conditions which rendered the destruction of the Union certain, namely, an armistice and cessation of hostilities, accompanied by the false and flagitious declaration, calculated to encourage the enemies of our country at home and abroad, namely, that the war to suppress the rebellion was a failure. Remember, soldiers, that the McClellan platform declares that your battles are failures; that your blood has been shed in vain; that your arms can never crush the rebellion; that you are inferior in courage to the slave-holding rebels; that you must admit your defeat, throw down your muskets, return in disgrace to your homes, disband the army, lay up the navy, recall Generals Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Meade, and Gilmore, and Admirals Farragut, Porter, Dupont, Davis, and Winslow, and leave it to the civilians of Chicago, Vallandigham, Harris, Long, PENDLETON, and others, to negotiate a peace.

Now what is an armistice? It is defined to be a suspension of the war for a limited period. There may be condi-

tions added, but none are named in the McClellan Chicago platform. Of course, then, it means a cessation of hostilities by land and sea. Indeed, the platform is weaker than this, for it proposes directly a 'cessation of hostilities,' not by land only, or by sea only, but, of course, by *both, as the words are general*. Now then, the blockade of the rebel ports, and the capture or destruction of blockade runners and their cargoes, is war upon the ocean. This blockade, then, is to be abandoned during the armistice, for there is to be a cessation of hostilities upon the ocean and the land.

During this interval of peace, when there is to be no blockade of the Southern ports, what is to follow? By their own accounts and estimates, the Confederates have within their limits, in cotton (at present prices), tobacco, and naval stores, a value exceeding one billion of dollars in gold. Now then, so soon as the armistice was agreed upon, the war upon the ocean, including the blockade, having ceased, the whole of this cotton, tobacco, and naval stores, would be shipped to Europe, or partly to Nassau, on the way to Europe, and this enormous amount realized by the Confederate government in gold. We know what tremendous disasters have been produced by the cotton famine in England, France, and other countries. Now, the first effect of such shipments would be the total ruin of all our manufactures of cotton and other textile fabrics. But another still more serious result would follow. We know that Louis Napoleon is the bitter enemy of the Union; we know that he has again and again declared that we could not suppress the rebellion; that he has earnestly thrice endeavored to persuade the British Government to unite with him in acknowledging the independence of the South—twice through efforts made directly upon the British Cabinet, and once through Roebuck and Lindsay, members of the House of Commons, to induce it by a parliamentary

vote to compel the British Ministry to unite with the Emperor in acknowledging the independence of the South. That Louis Napoleon is our bitter enemy, is proved also by the French-Mexican war, in which England, and even Spain, separated from him. It is proved also by the diplomatic correspondence of Jefferson Davis, and by his friendly and approving recognition of the establishment of the French Imperial Government in Mexico. It is further proved by Louis Napoleon's own letter, in which he declared, that one of the objects of the Mexican war was the establishment of the equilibrium of the Latin race upon the American continent. It is further demonstrated by the proceedings of the French in Mexico, and especially recently at Matamoras, in the mutual aid given and received by the French and Confederate forces. Now, what is the meaning of establishing the equilibrium of the Latin race on the '*American continent*'? In the first place, it means European military intervention; in the second place, it means to embrace not only Mexico, but *the whole Latin race on the American continent*. By the Latin race is included all Spanish America. It means, then, in the future, if our Government is overthrown, that all Spanish America, from the northern boundary of Mexico to Cape Horn, is to be consolidated into one great Power under imperial sway. It means to include in this vast empire the command of the Isthmus of Tehauntepec, the route by Central America (about which Louis Napoleon has written so much), by Honduras and Chiriqui, but more especially the Panama, as also the Atrato routes.

In the great future, whoever commands these routes, especially together with that of the Isthmus of Suez, which I visited a few months since, and which Louis Napoleon has nearly completed, will command the commerce of the world, and, as a consequence, ultimately control the institutions of the world. Such are the tremendous prob-

lems teeming in the brain of Napoleon the Third, and all, as he believes, depending upon the destruction of the American Union. I speak of what I know from a residence now of nearly two years in Europe. Thus it is that Louis Napoleon intends to bring us within the centrifugal gravitation of the European balance of power. This wonderful man proposes to extend this system from the old continents to the new, embracing both, and thus hold in his grasp the equilibrium—the balance of power of the world. We may well imagine what that equilibrium will be when Napoleon the Third shall hold the balance in his hands. Already he has considerable possessions (insular and continental) in North and South America, and Mexico, under Maximilian, is substantially a French dependency. He holds Algiers. He is colonizing Egypt (as I myself saw this year) by his railroads and canals. He has seized and colonized Cochin China and Annam. He has made Italy a dependency on the bayonets of France. Now then, under these circumstances, when the blockade shall have terminated, and Jefferson Davis, who is quite as ambitious and even more talented than Louis Napoleon, shall hold in his hand more than a billion of dollars' worth of Southern products ready for immediate shipment, may he not, and will he not say, through his most able and adroit diplomatic representative at Paris, 'Recognize the independence of the South, and all these products shall be shipped for sale in France, and to French manufacturers,' and thus enable France to crush for the present the cotton manufacturers of all the rest of the world. It is well known in Paris that Mr. Slidell is upon terms of the most intimate association with Louis Napoleon, and has thoroughly convinced him that we cannot suppress the rebellion. Is it not, then, clear, anxious as Napoleon is for the success of the South, that he would, in the event of McClellan's election, at once recognize South-

ern independence. Indeed, it is the boast of the Confederate leaders in Europe, since the adoption of the platform at Chicago, that, upon the election of their candidates, without waiting four months for the inauguration in March next, Napoleon will **AT ONCE** recognize the Confederate government. Indeed, I do not doubt, from the circumstantial evidence (although I do not know the fact), that there is already a secret understanding between Jefferson Davis and Napoleon the Third to recognize the independence of the South upon the election of the Chicago candidates. Why wait four months, until the 4th of March next, when the American people, by indorsing the Chicago platform, shall have declared for peace, with the additional announcement in that platform, that the war for the suppression of the rebellion has failed?

If, indeed, that war has failed, and we cannot thus suppress the rebellion, it would not only be the right, but, upon the principles of international law, the duty of every foreign power to acknowledge Southern independence. Thus is it that the Chicago McClellan platform invites recognition. What is the meaning of the recognition of the independence of the South by France, under such circumstances? **IT MEANS WAR.** It means, in the first place, commercial treaties stipulating great advantages in favor of France, and perhaps other Powers. It means, of course, the overthrow of the blockade, so as to carry out those treaties. It means conditions destructive of our interests, and favorable to the recognizing Powers. It means advantages and discriminations in tariffs and tonnage duties, and navigation privileges, which would exclude us from Southern ports, including New Orleans and the mouth of the Mississippi, and deprive us of the markets of the South. Such a recognition, then, with its attendant consequences, means **war**—war not only with France, but probably with England and Spain, and other Powers. Doubtless, upon the

election of the Chicago candidates, Napoleon would again ask the Ministry of England to unite with him in recognizing the independence of the South, and to participate in the benefits of the proposed commercial treaties. Who can say that England, under the dangers and sacrifices incurred by a refusal, would again decline the offer?

It is clear, then, that the election of the Chicago candidates involves the most imminent peril of war with France, if not with England, both acting then in alliance with the Confederate government. That my country even then would accept the contest rather than the dishonor and ruin of disunion, I do believe; but who can predict the result of such a conflict? My countrymen, we are speedily approaching the very edge of a dark and perilous abyss, into which we may be soon plunged by the election of the Chicago candidates. I implore you not to make the dread experiment. You must know that there will be no recognition of the independence of the South by France or England, or any other Power, if Abraham Lincoln should be reelected in November next. The American people will then have loudly proclaimed, through the ballot box, that they can and will subdue the rebellion by force of arms; and that they will continue to negotiate from the mouths of our cannon, until the Southern armies shall have been dispersed and vanquished. Upon the news of the reelection of Mr. Lincoln reaching Europe, the Confederate stock, now waiting the success of the Chicago candidates, will fall, like Lucifer, to rise no more. American securities, including those of the Federal and loyal State Governments, of railroads, and other companies with real capital, will all be immensely appreciated. The difference in favor of our country, including the rise in greenbacks, would be equivalent in a few months to hundreds of millions of dollars. Nor is it only our stocks that will rise at home and abroad, but

the national character will be immensely exalted. The friends of our country and liberty in Europe, including the grand mass of the people, will echo back the exultant shouts of freedom as they roll on from the Pacific to the Mississippi, from the Mississippi to the lakes, and, bounding from the glad Atlantic, are carried by steam and lightning to the shores of Europe. The fetters of American Slavery will be broken by such a result, and man—immortal man, of whatever race or color, born in the image of his Maker, will emerge from chatteldom, and rise to the dignity of our common humanity.

There is one point still remaining of vast importance. It is the question of Slavery, so far as it yet lingers within our borders. Without entering upon other aspects of that case, we call attention to the proposed amendment for the purpose of abolishing Slavery on the recommendation of Congress and the ratification of three fourths of the States, as provided in the Federal Constitution. This is recommended by Mr. Lincoln, and it is a plank in the Baltimore platform. It passed the Senate by a more than two-thirds vote, but was defeated, *by the Democrats*, by a vote of 69 to 94, in the House, thus failing to receive the two-thirds majority of both Houses of Congress as required by the Constitution. If, as has been heretofore shown, Slavery is the great enemy of the Union, and was the sole cause of the rebellion, why not extirpate the *cause* of the war? Why not remove what may remain of Slavery after the war is ended, by the proposed amendment, as recommended by Mr. Lincoln? This is a war and a Union measure, calculated to crush the rebellion, to maintain the Union, and to prevent any future effort to effect its overthrow. This measure, which would settle finally and forever the Slavery question, will succeed at an early period, if Mr. Lincoln should be re-elected. But this measure the Democrats oppose, and desire to *keep open* the Slavery question,

for no object that can be perceived, except to renew the old party alliance between Slavery South and its Northern supporters, with a view to party triumphs. If General McClellan succeeds, Slavery, so far as it still exists, will be cherished, maintained, and perpetuated. The viper will be warmed into life again, and although it might perhaps recoil for the present, it would only be to strike at some future period with greater force and venom at the life of the Republic. These men tell us they are for the *Union as it was*. Are they for the revival of such scenes as were perpetrated by Brooks in the American Senate? Are they for the Kansas frauds and murders and forgeries, including the forgery of a constitution? Are they for the right of secession, or, while they dispute the right of a State to secede, do they deny with Buchanan and Pendleton the right of the Government to prevent its secession? Are they against secession, but against coercion also? Are they against rebellion, but opposed to its overthrow by force? Throughout the South, under the Union as it was, there was no freedom of speech or of the press, on any question connected with Slavery. Are they for the sale, under the Union as it was, even of free negroes into perpetual bondage? Are they for the denial of the rights of Northern citizens throughout the South? Above all, are they for the renewal of the African slave trade, as notoriously occurred in 1859 (during the Administration of Buchanan), at Savannah, in Georgia, when the wretched victims, just stolen from their native homes in Africa, were carried to Savannah, and there, in defiance of the Federal Constitution, openly distributed by sale among the boasted chivalry of the South? If the Chicago candidates and their party are for these things—if they are for the Union as it was in these respects, I am against them. I am for the Union (as clearly intended by the fathers and founders of the Government) as it will be when Slavery (its great,

and, in fact, its only domestic foe) shall have been entirely extinguished. While I am for the extinction of Slavery as a Union and as a war measure, I am consoled by the reflection that, while it will secure the perpetuity of the Union, it will vastly increase our wealth and power, and advance all our industrial and material interests. For several years past I have examined this question, and, in various essays, published at home, but more especially abroad, have proved by official statistics, from the censuses of 1850 and 1860, that, under the system of free labor and free schools which exist in the North, as compared with the South, the product of the Free States is \$217 *per capita*, and that of the slaveholding States \$96 *per capita*. Also, that the lands of the South are worth \$10 per acre, and of the North \$25 per acre. It was further proved by me, in those essays, by the same official data, that, exactly in proportion to the number of slaves is the decreased production *per capita* in the Slave States; that of South Carolina, with 402,406 slaves and 291,388 whites, being \$66 *per capita*, and of Delaware, with 90,589 whites and 1,798 slaves, being \$143 *per capita*; while that of Massachusetts, with her sterile soil and severe climate, and far inferior natural advantages, was \$235 *per capita*; and the same rule was also shown to hold in counties of the same Slave States, those counties with few slaves always producing more *per capita* than those having many. The result was, as shown by the census, that if the production of the South in 1859 had been equal *per capita* during the same year to that of the Free States, the additional value of the Southern products would have been \$1,531,631,000 in 1859, and in the aggregate of the decade from 1859 to 1869, \$17,873,539,511, exclusive of the addition from the annual reinvestment of capital. The addition, then, to the value of the products of the South in a single year, caused by the substitution of free for slave labor, would be nearly equal to

our whole present national debt, while in the aggregate of the ten years succeeding it would be nearly ten times greater than the whole national debt, thus leaving us far richer after the next census, as a consequence of increased production, notwithstanding the national debt, than if the rebellion had never occurred. Thus is it that the ways of Providence are justified to man, and that Slavery chastises its own advocates, while its overthrow brings increased wealth and safety and honor and happiness and prosperity to the country. While I do not advocate, then, the abolition of Slavery in defiance of the Constitution, because it would make us more wealthy and powerful, more honored, happy, and prosperous, yet I rejoice that in supporting emancipation, as Mr. Lincoln does, as a Union and as a war measure, the overthrow of this accursed institution will be attended with countless benefits to my country and mankind. Suppress the rebellion by the overthrow of the Southern armies, and re-establish the Government throughout all our wide domain upon the broad and eternal foundations of freedom, truth, and justice, then neither domestic traitors nor foreign despots will ever dash against its adamant base. There it will stand, and stand forever, the mighty continental breakwater between the continents of Asia and of Europe, against which the breakers of eternal faction, and the waves of despotic power would dash in vain. To that home of the oppressed, to that asylum of genuine and universal freedom, millions from the Old World would then come, and unite with us in strengthening and maintaining a Government based upon the rights of humanity, and sustained by the affections of the people. While our physical force and accumulating wealth would thus be rapidly and vastly augmented, our moral power would be increased in a still grander ratio. Then the cry of tyrants, that self-government is a phan-

tom, and republics a failure, would cease to oppress the listening ear of humanity. Then the chains would soon fall everywhere from the limbs of the slave. Then the reactionary and feudal party of Europe, now so loudly proclaiming republics a failure, while exulting over the anticipated fall of the American Union, would retire discomfited from the contest, while the rights of man would be immensely promoted, and civilization advance, at a single bound, more than in the lapse of many centuries. The great liberal party of England, headed by those immortal champions Bright and Cobden, would rouse like giants refreshed from their slumber, and carry the flag of the vote by ballot and extended suffrage triumphantly throughout the British realm, while Ireland, oppressed Ireland, would then receive the fullest justice. Then, indeed, all past differences between England and America would be sunk forever in fraternal concord, and the peace of the world be maintained. Then Napoleon the Third, who keeps an army of 600,000 men as a standing menace to Europe and the world, and who has just, for the present, and for the present only, extinguished in blood the freedom of Mexico, must abandon his ambitious projects, or shiver his diadem upon the adamant rock of popular freedom.

But there are complaints from the so-called Democratic party that the President, and especially the Secretary of State, have surrendered the Monroe doctrine, and abandoned Mexico to her fate. There is no truth in this accusation. The President and the Secretary of State, *as regards the future*, are wholly uncommitted on this question, unless, indeed, it be for Mexico, by announcing that the people of the loyal States are unanimously in her favor. I say they are uncommitted for the future, and the real objection to their course is this: that they have not gratified the South and its Northern allies, by engaging, ere this, in a war with

France, so as to bring her vast forces in aid of the Confederate government. Indeed, Mr. Seward is cursed everywhere by the Confederates and their allies throughout Europe for preventing a war, *at this time*, on the Mexican question, between France and the United States. 'There is a time for all things,' and, as I have said before, our only question *now*, is the salvation of the Union; and when that is secured, will be the proper period to consider other subordinate questions, foreign or domestic. No man can speak with more feeling on this question than myself, for it is a well-known fact that I earnestly opposed, as a member of the Cabinet of Mr. Polk, the Mexican treaty of 1848, among other reasons, upon the suggestion then made by me, that if we abandoned Mexico, it would subject us to the danger of European interference there (just as it has occurred) by force of arms. That treaty was carried by a constitutional majority of only three votes, mainly through the instrumentality of Mr. Calhoun, who was against the invasion of Mexico, and for 'masterly inactivity,' resting on the banks of the Rio Grande, because he knew (as declared in my Texas letter of January, 1844) 'Slavery never could cross the Rio Grande,' and that, as a consequence, all of Mexico which we would permanently hold, as we ought to have done, from Texas to Tehuantepec, would, Mexico having abolished Slavery, have become Free States. I believed also that the permanent occupation and annexation of Mexico would have forever settled all the dangers of the Slavery question, because it would have flanked the Slave States of the Southwest, by many powerful Free States adjacent on the Southwest, containing already seven millions of people, most of whom were of the colored race, and who would have fought to the last against the reëstablishment of Slavery.

Yet, strong and decided as is my opposition to the course of Napoleon on the Mexican as well as the Confederate

question, I believe that the course of Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Seward on this question has been marked by great courage, devoted patriotism, and the highest statesmanship. I am not for mingling this or any other question of foreign or domestic policy with the maintenance of the Union, but have only answered the assaults of adversaries on the Mexican and other subordinate issues. This, however, I must say: that the treaty with Mexico, by which we abandoned that country, having been ratified, I am opposed to any violation of its provisions. While I adhere to the opinions expressed at the time by me against that treaty; while I am opposed to forcing Mexico into our Union, I believe that Napoleon the Third, unwittingly, by his invasion, has caused Mexico soon to gravitate, by the overwhelming wish of her people, into the arms of the great Republic. Thus is it that the French invasion will have settled forever in our favor the question of the American equilibrium.

I have published the views expressed in these letters on consultation with no one. They are my own individual opinions, and I only am responsible for them. It is quite possible that the Administration may differ from some of them, but I am just as independent of the Administration as they are of me. I am not, and never was, a Republican, and while I have been falsely charged in Europe with abandoning my free-trade principles, in consequence of the constant and earnest support given by me to Mr. Lincoln, it must be remembered that a majority of his Cabinet of 1863 had been Democrats, and supported the Tariff of 1846. But the Tariff is a very subordinate question, compared with the salvation of the Union. Besides, if the Tariff of 1846 was changed, it was not until the 2d of March, 1861, and the change was caused intentionally, by the previous withdrawal of the Senators and Representatives of the seceded States from both Houses of Congress.

I have another answer to this charge. I was for the *free list* of the Tariff of 1842, as distinctly stated in my first annual Treasury report, so as to increase our exports, especially of dyed cotton goods, thereby producing a corresponding augmentation of our imports and revenue. That portion of the act of 1846 was defeated by Mr. Calhoun, much to my regret, injury, and annoyance.

Besides, the South, by its rebellion, and by thus forcing on us an enormous Federal debt, has rendered impossible for many years any other Tariff but that which will bring the largest revenue. Until this debt is paid, we must have the highest Tariff for revenue, and it can be so arranged as, while yielding, when the Union is restored, at least \$150,000,000 annually in gold, at the same time to furnish all incidental aid to American industry that could be desired.

I have thus far discussed the question as confined to the contest between the respective candidates for the Presidency of the United States. But let those who think of supporting General McClellan for the Presidency remember that, in sustaining him, they must necessarily vote for Mr. Pendleton for the Vice Presidency. McClellan and Pendleton are the Siamese twins of Chicago, inseparable, and all who vote for the one, vote at the same time for the other. No voter can cast his suffrage in this contest, except by voting for an electoral ticket, and the same electors for General McClellan who may be chosen in any State, are to vote for Mr. Pendleton for the Vice Presidency. In other words, if General McClellan is chosen President, Mr. Pendleton is elected at the same time to the Vice Presidency of the United States. Now, recollect, that the Vice President not only presides over the Senate of the United States, and gives the casting vote in that body, but that, in case of the death of the President, the Vice President becomes President

of the United States. Now, two Presidents of the United States, within the last twenty-three years, have died during their term of office (Harrison and Taylor), and one of them within a month after his inauguration. In both these cases, the Vice Presidents chosen on the same electoral ticket with the President, reversed the policy of the President elect. Tyler reversed the policy of Harrison, and Fillmore reversed the policy of Taylor. Why may not the same thing again occur, if Mr. Pendleton, by the death of General McClellan, should succeed him as President? This renders an inquiry into the course and views of Mr. Pendleton a question of vital importance.

Now, Mr. Pendleton, as his votes and speeches show, is against the war for the Union, and has declared the coercion of a seceding rebel State not only '*impracticable*,' but '*unconstitutional*.' His words are, in his speech in Congress of the 18th January, 1861, after most of the Cotton States had seceded: 'Sir (he then said) the whole scheme of coercion is impracticable. It is contrary to the genius and spirit of the Constitution.' In accordance with these anti-coercion and anti-war views, he continued to vote against the prosecution of the war, and against all the great measures passed for that purpose. He further then said, 'If your differences are so great that you cannot or will not reconcile them, then, gentlemen, let the seceding States depart in peace; let them establish their government and empire, and work out their destiny according to the wisdom which God has given them.' This is exactly the doctrine of Jefferson Davis, and of all the rebel leaders: '*LET US ALONE*.' *Let us alone*, while we overthrow the Government and dissolve the Union; *let us alone*, while we seize the mouth of the Mississippi, and tear down or shoot down the flag of the Union from every fort of the South. This is their language, and the Chicago Convention might just as well have nominated

Jefferson Davis as George H. Pendleton as their candidate for the Vice Presidency of the United States. Such a nomination of an avowed disunionist shows the true spirit of the Chicago Convention, and that all their general expressions of devotion to the Union were mere empty sounds, calculated to secure votes, but utterly false and hypocritical; for, while indulging in these pharasaical expressions of love for the Union, they nominate, at the same time, as their candidate for the Vice President, an avowed secessionist and disunionist. We have nothing to do with the abstract opinions or wishes of Mr. Pendleton as regards the Union. Jefferson Davis repeatedly, and up to the very period of secession, expressed quite as much devotion to the old flag and to the Union as Mr. Pendleton. But Mr. Davis soon became the head of the rebellion which Mr. Pendleton declares we ought not, and have no constitutional power, to suppress by force. For all practical purposes, then, Mr. Pendleton is just as much a secessionist and disunionist as Jefferson Davis. Nor can it be alleged that Mr. Pendleton has changed these views. On the contrary, as late as this year he voted in Congress against the test resolution of Green Clay Smith, of Kentucky, declaring 'that it is the political, civil, moral, and sacred duty of the people to meet the rebellion, fight it, crush it, and forever destroy it.' Now then, the Chicago Convention, with a full knowledge of these votes and speeches, nominated Mr. Pendleton for the Vice Presidency, and contingently for the Presidency of the United States. They knew full well that Mr. Pendleton had declared the effort to crush the rebellion impracticable and unconstitutional, and that, therefore, if the power they proposed to give him were ratified by his election, he could, and under his oath of office to support the Constitution, he must, disband our armies, terminate the war, and permit the dissolution of the Union to be consummated; or he

might repeat his own words of 1861: Let the seceding States depart in peace; let them establish their government and empire, and work out their destiny according to the wisdom which God has given them.' It is, then, a sufficient objection to the Chicago candidates that Mr. Pendleton, one of the candidates, inseparably connected with General McClellan on the same electoral ticket, is, as we have seen, opposed to the war, and for all practical purposes as much a secessionist and disunionist as Jefferson Davis. This being clear, if General McClellan is really for the war to save the Union, by crushing the rebellion, he must refuse to run on the same electoral ticket with Mr. Pendleton; and if he does not, the people and history will assign to him the same position. He cannot lend his name to aid the election of Mr. Pendleton on the same ticket with himself, and profess devotion to the Union.

There is yet another point on which I would say a word. It is this: From the proceedings of the Canada Confederates, and their Northern allies, and the outgoings of the Richmond press, I conclude that their last suggestion is this: two or more confederacies, Northern, Southern, Middle, New England, Northwest, Mississippi, and Pacific. They are to be united by free trade between them all, and by an alliance offensive and defensive. That is, whenever any one of these confederacies go to war, we are to join them in the conflict. Namely, if the Southern Confederacy wishes to conquer and annex Cuba or Porto Rico, or to conquer and extend slavery to Central America, and war follows, we are to join them in the war, and sustain them with our blood and treasure. If so, the temple of Janus will never be closed on our continent, and war will be our normal condition—a war not declared by us, or in our own interest, but by the South, as a foreign government. Such an alliance is visionary, ruinous, and imprac-

ticable. It is simply a scheme to secure Southern independence.

Then, as to the free trade to be secured by treaty between the several confederacies. Recollect that each of these nations is to be foreign and independent, and to have its separate treaties with foreign Powers. How long would such treaties and such an alliance last? Why, the flag of the South would scarcely float over the mouth of the Chesapeake and Mississippi, before the conflict with us of views and measures would begin, nursed and promoted by foreign Powers, where each of the new confederacies would have its separate ministers, representing distinct and discordant interests. When have such alliances or treaties lasted even for half a century? Where are all the leagues of antiquity or of modern Europe? Where are all such leagues and treaties even of the last century? Where is our own alliance with France of 1778? Where all such alliances and treaties even of the first half of the present century? They are all extinguished. Experience proves—the voice of history proclaims—that treaties or alliances between independent Powers are always of short duration, being soon swept before the gust of contending passions, or melted in the crucible of conflicting interests. Where is the celebrated alliance and treaty of 1814 and 1815 of Vienna, between the great European Powers, establishing FOREVER, by a congress, the balance of European power? Is there a single clause now in force? Where is the clause securing France to the Bourbons, and guaranteeing forever against the reign of any of the Bonaparte family? Where are the states whose independence was forever guaranteed by those treaties? Where are Parma and Modena and Tuscany? Where is Lombardy, where the Romagna, Naples, and the Two Sicilies? Where are the duchies of Lauenburg, Schleswig, and Holstein, and where the treaty of 1852 in regard to

them? All, all have passed away, just as would our proposed treaties or alliances. The first war would sweep them out of existence. No, my countrymen; as Washington, the father of his country, most truly told us in his Farewell Address: 'To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a Government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict between the parts, can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all time, have experienced.'

Washington thus foresaw and warned us against this most insidious proposition to divide our country into separate confederacies, no matter how strict the alliances between them might be; and let us adopt his counsels.

Is it not strange, while Italy and Germany seek, in Italian and German unity, relief from the ruin and oppres-

sion of so many independent states and governments, and are each making advances to that glorious consummation, that we are asked to adopt the reactionary policy, and separate glorious Union into distinct confederacies, soon to be followed by grinding taxation, by immense standing armies, and perpetual wars?

And now then, my countrymen, I bring this letter to a close, imploring you to give no vote which will subject the Union to the slightest peril. Come, then, my friends, of all parties, come, Republicans, and Whigs, and Democrats, and Irish and German and native citizens, trampling under our feet all past issues, and all old party names and prejudices, and, standing on this broad basis of principle, let us vote, not for men or parties, but for the salvation and perpetuity of the Union.

R. J. WALKER.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 012 028 380 7

